

### **Amendments to the Drawings**

Applicants respectfully present herewith replacement Figures 1A, 1B and 2 which include the desired changes, without markings, and which comply with §1.84. The changes made to Figures 1A, 1B and 2 are explained in the accompanying remarks section below.

### **REMARKS**

By this submission accompanying with a request for continued examination, claims 1, 3 and 5 are amended. Replacement Figures 1A, 1B and 2 have been submitted. No new matter is contained in the amendments. Accordingly, claims 1-6 are pending in this application and claims 1-6 are respectfully submitted for a timely examination. Claims 7-20 have been withdrawn from consideration.

#### **Replacement Figures 1 and 2**

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.83(a) because Figs. 1 and 2 of the drawings were not properly labeled as -- Prior Art --. Applicants respectfully present replacement Figs. 1A, 1B and 2 properly labeled as -- Prior Art --, which comply with § 1.84. Accordingly, Applicants request approval of the drawing changes, and the objection to be withdrawn.

#### **Rejection of Claims 1-6 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner asserts that claims 1 and 5 include subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the limitation of "a data supply circuit," as set forth in independent claim 1, is not found in the specification or the drawings, as filed. The Examiner also asserts that the limitation of "a precharge circuit precharging the first data line, the second data line, and

the test-dedicated line,” as set forth in claim 5, is not found in the specification or the drawings, as filed. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to replace the phrase: “a data supply circuit” with the phrase: “an internal circuit.” Applicants respectfully submit that the specification and drawings, as filed, satisfy the written description requirement with respect to the phrase: “an internal circuit.” In the embodiments of the present invention, the memory cell array 22 as illustrated in Figures 4 and 5 can be the “internal circuit” as recited in claim 1 of the present application. See, e.g., page 3, line 6 of the Application.

Applicants also have amended claim 5 to remove the phrase: “and the test-dedicated line.” Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 5 is consistent with the specification and the drawings, as filed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the written description rejection of claims 1-6.

**Rejection of Claims 1-3 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by AAPA. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a semiconductor device comprising, among other features, a drive circuit configured to set, in the first operation mode, the first data line to a signal level responsive to said single value represented by the two complementary signals, and configured to set, in the second operation mode, the first data line to a signal level responsive to one of the two signals and the second data line to a signal level responsive to another one of the two signals after precharging the first and second

data lines, wherein the first operation mode is a read mode and the second operation mode is a test mode.

The Examiner asserts that AAPA discloses or suggests each and every element of Applicants' independent claim 1. In particular, the Examiner states "according to [Figure 2 of AAPA], regardless of the operation mode, data bus lines DB0-DB3 still [are responsive] to signal RDt from the sense amplifier 24." Office Action, Page 5, Lines 2 and 3. Applicants understand that the Examiner is equating this alleged feature of AAPA with the claim limitation that "in the second operation mode, the first data line [is set] to a signal level responsive to one of the two signals," as set forth in Applicants' independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of AAPA.

For example, in Figure 2 of AAPA, the TST signal becomes HIGH in the test mode, which results in the output of the NAND gate 26 being fixed to HIGH, and the output of the NOR gate 30 being fixed to LOW. Therefore, **in the test mode, the data bus lines DB0-DB3 are not responsive to either the signal RDt or the signal RDc.** Consequently, AAPA fails to disclose or suggest at least the feature that "in the second operation mode, the first data line [is set] to a signal level responsive to one of the two signals ... wherein the first operation mode is a read mode and the second operation mode is a test mode" as set forth in Applicants' independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejection of independent claim 1 at least for this reason.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from allowable, independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner also withdraw the anticipation rejection of claims 2 and 3 at least for this reason.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1-6 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited prior art. Applicants also submit that the subject matter is more than sufficient to render the claims non-obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, and therefore respectfully request that claims 1-6 be found allowable and that this application be passed to issue.

If for any reason, the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper has not been timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to

counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referring to client-matter number 100353-00086.

Respectfully submitted,



Sam Huang  
Registration No. 48,430

Customer No. 004372  
ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Tel: (202) 857-6000  
Fax: (202) 638-4810

Enclosure: Petition for Extension of Time (three months minus one month)